

GAAC Meeting Minutes

Feb. 21, 2007

1-3:00pm

Room 001

Recorder: Esther Lucey

Juan Munoz, Chair

JoAnn Klinker, Roy Rodriguez, Joe Claudet, Yen To, student representative
Sylvia Mendez-Morse, Alfredo Benavaides, Eva Midobuche, Ratna Narayan,
Bret Hendricks

Juan convened meeting at 1:00pm. Do any members need copies of proposals?

Eva – latest ones are what Joe Claudet distributed and I downloaded them.

Juan – anyone missing ethics proposal EDCI 5330?

Yen To, student representative from EP&L, missed first meeting, invited today by Juan to introduce herself.

Juan – I will put together a complete set of handout materials for you. I asked people for a copy of their notes in an email, whether taken any, not sure of what transpired last meeting. I scribbled on the proposals.

Sylvia – yes I have my notes which include: EDBL 5321 had recommendations that the outcomes included need to have more direct connections to terms such as literacy and bi-literacy.

Eva – I was not part of the committee last meeting (November 2006).

Sylvia - Same recommendations to 6347 that the outcomes listed were not directed as to focus.

Juan - I recall that as well.

Juan – no permanent record, no recall, was he chair then?

JoAnn - Yes voted in then, I did not take minutes.

Juan - So from this point forward Joe Claudet will be responsible for minutes.

Juan - 3 courses, 3 EP&L and 1 Dewey course. New member is Eva, replacing Rose per JoAnn.

Juan: We will review the proposals in the order they are listed on Agenda. Start with EDBL 5321. As I recall, I thought for 5321 we have very minor changes.

Alfredo - at last meeting I was taking notes. My understanding - those changes were to go to author, who would get back to me, I would then forward the corrected proposal to Joe and Walter. It is not a necessary step to go through me. I communicated to the author about the changes.

Juan – do the proposals here today reflect the changes?

Joe: Are these are the ones with the minor recommended changes?

Juan – EDBL 5321 – one of his notes on 5321 are like Sylvia's. On student learning outcomes would be more directly addressing bi-literacy.

Eva – hopes she has the first draft. She had a question on page 1, then she stopped reviewing, thinking it was not the most current proposal.

Juan – his copies of proposals submitted at last meeting are the same as the ones in front of us today – so nothing is changed on the ones from Joe?

Consensus – no changes.

Juan – these are the exact proposals we reviewed in Nov, nothing has changed. We have other business. Motion?

Sylvia – motion – send back to author to fix. Seconded by JoAnn

Eva – I have made notes for changes.

Juan – Motion made and seconded: To return proposals to the original author and add Eva's recommendations.

Juan – My direction would be to the program coordinator, keep motion to return to author for changes.

Sylvia – why go through the program coordinator?

Juan – Proposals are submitted through the department chair. I recommend they go to forwarding person, the program coordinator; these are the changes we expect and have them make changes and submit to him, or through coordinator then to him.

Sylvia - recommend go to chair, to program, to author.

Alfredo - Be specific as to the changes, not rely on the verbal record, you are talking about a 20 page template that needs changes.

Sylvia – Yes, there are typos, changes to be made from our first review,

Alfredo – suggests a better way of what is specific.

Juan – table motion and go back through document to get corrections. I will make corrections and forward to dept. chair, who gives to author, per Sylvia's motion.

Juan – on page one course template

Eva-look at is this, is it a foundations or method class. Nature of course, more of a methods course, foundation needs to be clarified. Thought it was a methods course. Course purpose: "no prior knowledge" – that needs to be looked at as this is the third or fourth class, not the initial class, so students can be assumed they have knowledge. So remove "no" because it is a sequence of courses and this is the third or fourth in the sequence, so it is not the first. There should be –

Bret – include reference to the appropriate sequence as stated in program catalog.

Sylvia – I agree

Eva – I think it was taken out of a foundation class template.

Juan – is this a foundation or methods course? Need to be clear.

Eva – prior knowledge is needed if it is a sequence.

Eva – On page 1, look - no emphasis on literacy, hanging there with no emphasis to literacy, taught primarily in Spanish, literacy has to be strong.

Juan – was it better through the program?

Eva – Yes, we (the program) made assumptions that the person would correct.

Sylvia – assumed this copy was fixed.

Alfredo – at a template and he is looking at syllabus. Under course purpose, this is foundation course.

Juan-given the kind of deficiencies you are detecting from disciplinary expertise, go paragraph by paragraph or return this proposal to program for revision?

Alfredo – go back to program.

Eva – she made requests for the changes.

Juan – and we made requests for emphasis on bi-literacy and this has not taken place.

Eva – apologizes from our program and she was surprised, we looked at this and they are not fixed, this is new person, started in August, a rush for templates.

Juan - our role (GAAC) is to provide assistance.

Alfredo – provide coursework appropriately.

Sylvia – a general comment – proposal revisions go to chair, to program, to author. We need a close analysis of references to the course number and title, be consistently articulated, refer to other course number, needs to have correction of typo errors.

Eva – references - I think what happened is it was copied and pasted. Be careful with NCATE standards.

JoAnn: one other thing to be added, her course was approved, the Graduate Council will require a justification statement on every course we send to them and to help out with that I have examples of justification statements. They must be included with every new, or revamped, changed course, because they are checking closely.

Juan - motion to return proposal back to department is tabled and with amendment to be returned to author and with justification statement.

Sylvia - I want a memo from the author as to where changes were made.

Juan: Motion – the author is to provide a memo explaining how the deficiencies were address or corrected.

Joe Claudet – good idea

Juan – the Motion: To return the proposal to the department for revisions and then forward it to the GAAC with the revisions, a justification statement and a memo enumerating where the changes were made.

Eva – the particular changes.

Joe Claudet – restated motion.

Juan - So move and seconded. Ayes – all. Opposed – none. Motion carries.

JoAnn – I would like to make a request, Eva you are new to the committee, her program area, and Doug Simpson not here to do it, can we move up the agenda for Roy to present now? He teaches tonight and needs to eat lunch. Is that right?

Roy – yes, I will sit around until my turn on the Agenda.

Ratna – I have no objection.

Juan – HIED proposal by Roy is next, which is out of sequence.

JoAnn – I have 4 questions. First, part D, proposal well written, clear, if the southwest is open, why off campus?

Roy – I think those places are a good place to start and are doable as a program such as before you. It is in my opinion, after considerable research, going to be very appealing to whole state of TX, the calls and requests from every community college and private institution in state. We can't handle that, stick to service area in initial stages. I spoke with president and instructors who are enthusiastic and raring to go. This is all we can handle now.

Sylvia - the southwest in us.

JoAnn - page 3, above III, and so I thought if this went forth with this listed, he may be locked in, just put “in the future” it might provide the necessary language.

Roy-on the distance type program, be careful you don't bite more than you can handle. The demand is there, no one is doing programs like this in the US, certainly not in TX. There is a great need especially among community colleges for these kinds of opportunities – masters' degrees.

Juan – In the interest of time: Do we want to pose direct questions now or do we want to discuss and have the person chime in as appropriate as we will be setting a precedent now and for the future - to utilize in a very direct way?

JoAnn- Yes, have Roy answer the 4 questions I have now. Next, do we as practitioners use research because no action research is listed on tools course?

Roy - I am bound by the exact program that we offer today in the EDHE for Ed.D. If I was to add anything, after discussing this with Joe Claudet and his recommendation was to stick with the program we have approved now. My opinion - the Ed.D. program needs tremendous revision – EDHE only.

Juan – is this in regards to this specific proposal or tangentially where located?

Roy – a program like this, the current coursework needs to be revisited. What we offer today, this minute, I don't want to go there, will delay another 3 years, start and offer what we have now and as we move forward, other committees will establish courses, may be more flexible, may make changes. Now the Ed.D. in EDHE is the one I am proposing to offer at a distance.

Eva – action research is not included as a course here, but under 7, in Requirements, it says they should have action research.

Roy – more than willing to add, dissertations should be action research, in my opinion, based on some research, this is my opinion. This is the type these student who will grow, with support from their institution, to do research and funding to help their institution.

Eva – works for Ed.D., so consider adding Ph.D.?

Roy – My concern is we address cultural issues, conjure up residency, possibility of distinct differences.

Eva - Primary cohort every 3 years so as not to overwhelm the system.

Roy – yes there is demand. We could have cohorts more regularly. At this juncture, to appear before the coordinating board, we don't want to do more than we can handle. We can have 20-25 students.

JoAnn – for myself, I vote for action research.

Sylvia – consider doing cohort in 2 years because this goes through the university process and everywhere the request is to build enrollment. So, maybe, I don't know, can you sell it?

Roy – that is up to others to make the decision. 2 things to work program: One is the interest – the will to do it by the faculty. I have the will and by the will of COE. Second are the resources. I need resources which includes faculty, to provide for distance ed, instructors not willing or problems with that, then we won't go far and to try to get a cohort every 2 years is a problem.

Juan – no doubt the program is necessary. Are we putting cart before horse? We do not have faculty now to support 6 tenured faculty. Now there are 2 faculty with 2 open positions, there is nothing to say the faculty now, with 36 units, can be transplanted just from technology or what kind of mechanism for course equivalency. Faculty proposed is Valerie Paton, Mike Shonrock, no guarantee. They are staff in student affairs and can be reassigned. How can this cohort model be carried out with current faculty now? Am I wrong in understanding that there is a significant backlog of students?

Roy – yes, it is all about maintaining the status quo or to push forward with creativity, we need this program. To maintain, we are doing a good job. 60 doc students in EDHE program, majority are employees of TTU. Three-quarters of the students are employees. In my opinion, that is not much of a doctoral cohort with employees of the same university. No doubt the biggest problem is lack of faculty. We hope to be able to hire 2 this semester.

Juan – we are considering, now, this program. If we say yes in concept, and what we conceptually re-approve, understanding that resources are moderately available. No guarantee, two years carry over, that additional faculty may be forthcoming. We will need additional faculty.

Roy – not with plan as is. As Sylvia asked, if 2 years then a new cohort, 2 years would grow program faster and it would need more faculty.

Juan – maintain the status quo. My question, I can't get beyond this based on current resource and we are considering adding to the load?

Sylvia- there are tangential aspects, as faculty, to add. We try to grow ourselves to be a research institute. As a program we are having difficulty hiring. Share some pains as Roy's program does. We are two programs with a lot of students with the least resources of faculty. Challenges because of TTU administrators, provost, and your folks, not paying what people expect and yet being told to grow enrollment, without the pay. Sometimes somebody needs to give and I strongly feel that, Juan, you need to take that message up, as to your title, not being mean, you are our voice.

Juan – I agree, not enough, not enough now and we are considering more.

Sylvia- shows them we have the potential.

Juan – it will take a year to go through the coordinating board.

JoAnn - in two years, allows time and with cohort of 7-10 every 3 years equates to 3-4 in every course.

Juan – I'm not sure it will take that much time for the coordinating board.

JoAnn - Yes it takes time.

Joe – distance ed coordinating board will not approve unless tangible faculty in place and growth of faculty is an issue, so Juan's points well taken.

JoAnn – Sylvia point, as our committee...

Juan – I think this is ok, yes we need this program, yes students find it appealing. We don't have current resources to carry it out.

Roy – yes that's true, that kind of thinking will stop growth.

Sylvia - Build it and they will come.

Juan – go ahead and promote with resources now and the 36 units. Where we are in two years, 36 units, the grad student, will allow?

JoAnn - yes write a letter, for 40-42 that works.

Eva – on different types of courses, is there one that addresses cultural issues? And the work, diversity is embedded, any way to build more?

Roy – yes, this is a flimsy excuse, this is what is offered now. Am I happy; is it what I would show as a model to get a doctoral in EDHE? Absolutely not. Change it - I can't. It is probably not good to do at this juncture. As we evolve with our independence in our programs, hopeful. As to ad hoc committee, direction for instructor supervision, for community colleges, working with students, need to meet not just higher ed, need there, but not now.

Juan – we can't add a course.

Roy – risky now.

Juan – Motion – are we complete with discussion? Yes – Motion?

Syliva – I motion we approve the EDHE doctoral community college as a distance education program as written with suggestions that language to B changes and research contributions to work on appropriate research courses, publications of those teaching.

Juan - Motion is to approve the proposal with section d changes and include reference contributions. Aye-majority. Juan – abstain. No opposed.

Juan- Move the order. Chair discretion to now go to EDCI 6331 Dewey course. If you turn to page 8, I was responsible for communicating to the author the only change: last line under topical outline, “approach is”. The change was carried out, no other recommendations.

JoAnn – I motion approve the changes on EDCI 6331, course go forward.

Ratna- seconded.

Juan – Motion made and seconded. Aye-all. None opposed. Motion passes unanimously with change on p8, requested changes made.

Joe – comment - when trying our patience is over the top, you are talking faster than I can talk. Half joking, you are doing a wonderful job. Try to stay focused. Discussion should have taken place before this group meeting and if it requires that depth, we shouldn't look at it. When it comes to this committee, homework should have been done, no signature on it yet.

Juan – My presumption, we are looking at philosophy too deeply, that recommendations were not well received. EDCI 6347 now, we will return to Agenda outline: Assessing diverse student.

JoAnn – came before us last time.

Juan – change similar to bi-literacy suggestions.

Sylvia – student outcomes related to literacy.

Eva - yes, changes were submitted to authors, with changes recommended.

Juan – has most recent copy is from Joe and I have the original from last meeting.

Joann – title, under add, the course title, issues in assessment – not spelled correctly; on the cover sheet it is not correct.

Juan – page 2, rely on my memory, we recommend the outcomes more closely linked. So, look at outcomes, same as bi-literacy class, nothing has been changed. Yes, this is what we have in the office. This proposal is unchanged.

Joe – the recommendation was for student learning outcome assessment be worded to be more aligned with assessments.

Sylvia – questions about what was being used to assess the outcomes did not match with what the outcome was. So course assessments that were more prescriptive or related to what the student outcome was.

JoAnn – more specifically generated to the course.

Juan – page 3 example, first box, 2nd paragraph – comparative “”. I have my notes, so my brackets mean it was discussed.

Bret – this appears to be unchanged, I would be frustrated.

Juan – both of these authors changed it, so which versions did not get here? We did not solicit from them, for program’s dept as to who sent it back.

Eva – it has the old date and signature.

Bret – it appears unchanged.

Sylvia – Motion that we return the template for EDBL 6347 to the dept. to be given to the program chair, to be given to the author, stating that there are no changes and we want that person to address our original concerns and to return the revised template to the GAAC accompanied by a memo explaining where the changes have been made.

Bret - and a justification statement added.

Joe – Sylvia’s motion involves indicating that the author is to address our original concerns, resubmit revised proposal, etc.

Seconded by Bret.

Juana: Aye-all. Opposed-none.

Joe – motion, 2nd, motion made.

Joe - this suggests that the administrative staff needs bunker training. Even if they had been here it would not have changed anything. No open venue for the changes to be made. Forwarded documents.

Juan – somehow the forwarded documents did not reach their destination.

JoAnn – we have not reviewed ethics.

Juan – 2 points. First: EDCI 5330, do each of you have a copy of the cover sheet? Doug Simpson did include the proposed template form, little form, prefix, number, etc.. Not required for course proposal, he has it. Yes, they have it.

Juan – moving to the course, do we want to begin with any comments?

JoAnn- teaching, but the grad council is monitoring very closely the courses that match others or may match EDLD 6310, her course – Ethics. But he has geared toward teaching and mine is toward administration; basically cover the same thing.

Juan - asked about the same thing. That kind of redundancy is the responsibility of this committee. It is for us to determine if it is productive or unnecessary.

Joe – is it redundant or duplicative? One way to get at that is to take course syllabus and compare with other syllabi.

Juan-is that our duty? I would like some kind of explanation.

Sylvia – isn’t there a mechanism that they check off to show no other course(s) offered through the university?

JoAnn – yes I did that.

Sylvia -and didn’t you make that statement?

JoAnn – yes I told Fred that it is not there. Roy can get around it because he is assessing teaching, mine assesses administration. Same theories? My suggestion is to approve with understanding that the graduate council may not. They are looking closely at duplication. So I don't and he has it as ethics in teaching with rationale selected "ethics" and saying multicultural and specifics ... teaching student teachers....

Juan – differentiate "a critical study of extracurricular ethical theory in education and implicit for teaching and --- emphasis curriculum, which is different than teaching.

JoAnn - he goes on, my course is same. Needs to align more with curriculum and articulate more visibly.

Bret – make course more resilient to stand alone.

JoAnn – we will try to help him get it through. Take a course she has and a philosophy course.

Joe – Reason?

Bret – same pools used. He needs to articulate.

Joann – they will say , they can that what they can get from your course, not from my course, is curriculum. I do not spend time on it.

Joe – this is a key function of this meeting. This committee is at college level and this level of oversight is important to look at properly from a program and does it duplicate across a college?

Juan – another question. Under "evaluation": look at the methods of instructional methods, field exp, specifically, some evaluation is not computed Curriculum & Instruction. Enough from me. We spoke of generic learning outcomes, but like written case study analysis, page 6 evaluation - some of them are appropriate, not changed, generic, all templates.

JoAnn – the assessment in boxes on page 5, student learning outcome - Ethics in teaching, general part... specific.. Articulate, with same thing and page 5. We need to get past that. I was talking with Nora; they (Graduate Council) will look at it very critically. College of Education has submitted more new courses than any others. He sited specifics in learning outcome so just address those on page 5. Go ahead the way it is. It will be strengthened if we add it.

Juan – can this dislodge the proposal from being approved, isn't it incumbent on us to bring to the author's attention?

Bret – we don't want it to fail.

Juan – justification statement – yes, page 1.

JoAnn – make course description and purpose, curriculum and leaders, could be?

Juan – use educators. Most of the emphasis is on teaching, not duplicative, emphasize differences, the pool of students, emphasize curriculum,.

Bret – widespread interest among students, this is an elective course.

JoAnn- not very popular.

Bret – integral to our field. Everyone needs it. Helps to bolster if he says it appeals to this group of students and it is different from hers so not appear redundant.

Sylvia– the difference is that yours is a counseling course.

JoAnn – goes back to the emphasis on curriculum.

Sylvia – justification is broad and I prefer more targeted.

Juan – curriculum is in program, only that first line.

Joann – purpose is curriculum, leadership.

Sylvia – that could be and administrative. In addition, I would like for some aspect of diversity or multiculturalism be addressed in ethics because of the issues. Yes, metaethical, in a multicultural school. Two different things of multiculturalism: topical outline - should be something there. There is research out there on Hispanic ethics relating to multicultural ethics perspective in teaching and curriculum.

Juan – A motion? To adopt the recommendations captured by the minutes read by Joe?

Bret – Motion seconded.

Juan – motion made to make recommendations to EDCI 5330 and seconded.

Joe – adopt recommendation of the changes which I just read and send them forward.

Joann – Seconded.

Juan-All those in favor? Aye-all. Opposed-none. Motion passes.

Juan – We need to get back to the department chairs and give them copies of our Minutes. How long do meetings last – one and a half to two hours?

JoAnn – depends on how many proposals we need to review.

Juan – Old business: From my previous notes, no hanging, 3 topics previously discussed but subsumed in convoluted discussions so resolutions did not occur. Guidelines: Create a checklist, a simple one page list, and we don't have it. Yen to be assigned the responsibility of composing a draft for consideration that says "cover sheet". This is to include the graduate council justification, proposal, department signature, simple, before a course is submitted to do this. Yes, with your permission, Yen, I am charging you with doing it. Send your recommendations to her so she can complete a draft before next meeting and at next meeting, finalize and put in orange document.

JoAnn – Here is a copy of a justification letter.

Joe – course approval procedures are listed behind sample in the handouts provide.

Juan – Yen, talk with Sylvia about this form and create a discernable hybrid.

Joe – please ask me for help. Call on me and we can do it together.

Juan – call on Joe and not on the committee members. That is what I wanted with that activity-trying to get it finalized. Two more issues – graduate assistantships and graduate travel.

JoAnn – why does this committee do this?

Juan – anything having to do with graduate education per the previous committee's interpretation is to include graduate students. If not our appropriate role, so be it. So then we motion to table it and it is no longer a purview of this committee.

JoAnn-I think we are encroaching on the administrator's job. Joe's job is to articulate.

Joe – do you remember when the Dean gave this committee its charge? We talked about what we do not want to see, not to take on the whole galaxy, do a great job, but be careful to limit, not do the handbooks it is a job for those compensated, to do the handbook.

Juan – Theses are also part of our permanent records as areas to look into. If not our purview, then make that motion.

JoAnn –is a motion needed? For the record, copies of current information are located on the College of Education website that any can access and read. It is clear how to apply for a graduate assistantship in the COE; here is what I have to do. Do we have a copy of that?

Juan – no, it is not an actionable item, no motion needed. We have reviewed the documents. We have satisfied old business, now to proceed.

Bret – is this a future purview?

Juan- make a motion to restrict the GAAC?

Joe – the purview is anything that relates to academic affairs of graduate issues. Example, if a student was to file a grievance, or potentially approved to get into a program and denied, after 2 attempts, can the student appeal to this body? You look at all the data and evidence. Student does not get travel support; they can appeal to this body. So be aware of procedure to impact your vote. Grades issues do not affect this committee. Potentially an appeal will.

Juan – existing business on the Agenda: Graduate assistantships and graduate travel, no longer old business. Any other old business? Let's move forward.

JoAnn – discussion. We looked at it and it is done.

Juan – discussion – anything else, courses, old business, overlooked, recommendations for next meeting?

Sylvia – it seems like there is discussion among faculty about the process of this committee. Do we still have to spread the word, somewhere on the COE web page?

Juan- the issue is - how can we put together something simple, coherent, identifiable, email to all, as part of COE's permanent webpage? Have a webpage as GAAC? Say to the dept. chairs, I say, you go to form, download, complete it and have it as the first thing and send it on to me? I will not bring a proposal to this to committee if it is not complete - not done.

JoAnn – we already have a faculty /staff web link, just add it to that.

Juan – many people do not know this. So we create a culture when it comes to submit a new course, follow the information on the webpage.

Bret –At the leadership council, I will disseminate this information there.

Juan – what was driven by an ethos of depth, specificity?

JoAnn – has our charge been clarified?

Sylvia – notes and submitted and sent around. Charge? Not sent to all committee members.

Bret – not received by the board.

Juan-Any other business for the good of the order? We will meet the third Wednesday of every month in Room 203. Then we are adjourned at 2:25pm.